COURT OF CRIMINAL APPEALS NO. O2-0	
APPEAL TO ALABAMA COURT OF CRIMIN	NAL APPEALS
FROM	
CIRCUIT COURT OF MOLTOMEVY COUNT CIRCUIT COURT NO. CC- 0)-90 CIRCUIT JUDGE JYLMAN HOD	Y, ALABAMA
Type of Conviction / Order Appealed From: BC belog	
Sentence Imposed:	<u> </u>
Defendant Indigent: YES NO Kourtney	Sovern Greenwood, Alia
Macro Kirkland 361-6300 (Appellant's Attorney) Pryru St. (Telephone No.)	NAME OF APPELLANT
(City) (State) AL 36104 (Zip Code) V.	
STATE OF ALABAMA	NAME OF APPELLEE
(State represented by Attorney General) NOTE: If municipal appeal, indicate above, and enter	
name and address of municipal attorney below.	FILED
	FEB 1 1 2003
(For Court of Criminal Appeals Use Only)	CLERK ALA COURT CRIMINAL APPEALS

STATE'S EXHIBIT

```
know him personally.
 1
           Q. Okay. How do you -- I mean -- so you've
 2
 3
      never talked to him?
 4
           Α.
                No.
               Okay. Have you seen him since that March
 5
       date in any situation, have you seen him since
 6
 7
       then?
                I might have.
 8
           Q. You -- but certainly you have seen him in
 9
       a social occasion or a conversation or anything
10
11
       else, right?
       A. You know how you glance at folks and then
12
       you don't really pay attention --
13
                     MR. HARTLEY: Okay. No further
14
15
       questions. No further questions. Oh, wait. Wait.
16
           Q. Have you ever been convicted of any
17
       felonies?
18
           Α.
                Yes.
19
           Q.
              Huh?
20
           Α.
                Yes.
              How many?
21
           Q.
           Α.
               One.
22
23
           Q.
              What was it?
24
           A. A robbery first developed down to a theft
25
       of property.
```

```
Okay. Is that the only felony conviction
            Q.
 1
 2
       you've got?
            Α.
 3
                 Yes.
            Ο.
                 What other arrests have you had for
 4
       felony or crimes involving moral turpitude?
 5
                      MS. PERKINS: Objection, Judge.
 6
                      THE COURT: Okay. I think you need
 7
       to rephrase that remark.
 8
                      MR. HARTLEY: Okay.
 9
                 Okay. Do you have any other crimes that
10
            Q.
       you've been convicted of involving moral turpitude?
11
                      MS. PERKINS: Objection.
12
13
                      THE COURT: Do you know what moral
       turpitude is?
14
                      THE WITNESS: No, ma'am.
15
                      THE COURT: Okay.
16
                 All right. Is it your testimony that
17
            Q.
       your only felony is a robbery that was reduced to a
18
       lesser offense?
19
20
            Α.
                 Yes.
21
            Q. And what was the lesser offense?
22
                 Theft of property.
            Α.
23
                 Theft of property. Okay. Did you serve
            Q.
       any time for it?
24
25
            Α.
                 Boot camp.
```

1.	Q. Excuse me?	
2	A. Yes.	
3	Q. How much?	
4	A. Boot camp.	
5	MS. PERKINS: Objection, Judge.	
6	THE COURT: Sustained.	
7	REDIRECT EXAMINATION	
8	BY MS. PERKINS:	
9	${f Q}$. On March 30th, 2002, what well, let me	
10	go back. You said you do know of Kourtney; is that	
11	right?	
12	A. Yes.	
13	Q. And on that date, you saw him, didn't	
14	you?	
15	A. Yes.	
16	Q. And you saw him with Jamar Brown; is that	
17	right?	
18	A. Yes.	
19	Q. And he did have twists in his hair; is	
20	that right?	
21	A. Yes.	
22	MS. PERKINS: Nothing further of	
23	this witness, Judge.	
24	THE COURT: Then do you have	
25	anything?	

```
MR. HARTLEY: No further questions.
 1
 2
                      THE COURT: Okay. You're excused.
 3
       You can step.
                      (Witness excused.)
 4
 5
                      THE COURT: Do you have any other
 6
       witnesses?
 7
                      MR. HARTLEY: (Attorney nods.)
                      THE COURT: Does the State have any
 8
       other witnesses?
 9
10
                      MS. PERKINS: Nothing further,
       Judge.
11
12
                      THE COURT: So the State, at this
1.3
       time, rest?
14
                      MS. PERKINS: Yes.
15
                      THE COURT: And you renew your
       motions?
16
17
                      MR. HARTLEY: Renew our motion.
                      THE COURT: Okay. Both sides, at
18
19
       this time, have rested, and the attorneys will
       address you again and make closing arguments. Does
20
21
       anyone want to take a five-minute break?
22
                      (Juror raises hand.)
23
                      THE COURT: Do you need to take --
       let's take about five minutes.
24
                      THE JUROR: Really just a glass of
25
```

```
water would be fine.
 1
                      THE COURT: Okay. We can get you
 2
 3
       water. But you -- if you want -- why don't we just
       take a break if you --
 4
                      PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Well, I hate
 5
 6
       to --
                      THE COURT: That's okay.
 7
                      THE JUROR: Really, it's okay. Just
 8
       a glass of water would be fine.
 9
                      THE COURT:
10
                                 Okay.
11
                      THE JUROR: And I apologize.
12
                      THE COURT: That's okay. I've been
13
       having the same thing. Just not quite where you
14
       are yet.
1.5
           Are we ready to proceed?
16
                   MS. PERKINS: Did he make his
17
       motions on the record?
18
                      THE COURT: Yeah, he renewed his
19
       motion.
20
                      MS. PERKINS: Okay.
21
            Members of the jury, can you actually believe
       we're at the end of this case? I -- let me correct
22
23
       one thing from the beginning. This offense did
24
       happen on April the 9th. It did happen on
25
       April 9th. April 18th was the date that he was
```

developed as a suspect and that was on that picture. That was my mistake. And I want to clear that up. So, Mr. Greenwood was exactly right about what he said when he was sitting here on that particular offense. That's why I came back and asked him on April 9th. Because on that date, Ms. George (sic.) said that she was working, and that's why I asked her that she was working that night. And she still wasn't there on that night too. So the same line of questioning went to that particular night.

So, on April 9th, let's talk about what actually happened on April 9th of 2002. What happened? What really happened out there? What do we know? Okay. We do know that Mr. Copeland was walking down the street on Raintree over by Virginia Loop Road. We do know that two black males approached him. One put a gun to his head. The other held the young man that was near him. We do know that they took property from him. That, members of the jury, according to the law in the State of Alabama, equals a robbery.

A robbery -- and you're going to hear the law. She's going to tell you -- the Judge is going to tell you a lot about what that law is. A robbery

is when you have a theft, taking the property -taking the property without you giving the
authorization to take it. Okay. A robbery is a
theft. But in the course of committing the theft,
in this case, of his wallet -- his wallet, his
money, and his identification. In the course of
committing that theft, I use force against you.
Okay. And, in this case, that force is putting
that gun to his head. I think we would all agree
that that's force. If somebody puts a gun to your
head, you're pretty much going to give them what
they want. Okay.

And, in the course of committing the theft, you use force with intent to basically get this person to comply with what you want them to do -- to get them to do what you're trying to get them to do. That's what separates a theft from a robbery. And some people use burglary and exchange them for robbery, but that's not what we're here on.

Robbery, according to the law -- not what you saw on Law and Order -- but according to the law right here in the State of Alabama is in the course of committing the theft the use of force. We know, members of the jury, that that happened.

The question is, is this particular defendant

one of the ones who was out there participating?
That's what the issue in this case comes down to.
Okay. We know that the robbery took place. We know his property was taken. We know it was two people out there that did it. Was he one of the ones out there that did it? Was he?

Now, let's talk about Mr. Copeland for a second. Mr. Copeland got a good look at the two people out there who did this. One of those persons is Jamar Brown. He's the one that had the gun. The second of those persons, he has identified back then and he identified today to be this defendant. Okay.

Now, there has been a lot of issue in this case about twists -- about twists. And I don't know how many of you have seen twists on people's hair, how many of you know what a twists is. Okay. Or how long somebody has to be -- there's a lot of dispute about that. These are the pictures that the defendant submitted into evidence. Pretty kids too. But you're going to all get a chance to look at it. There's not an exhibit sticker, but I think there's --

THE COURT REPORTER: It's on the

back.

2.

MS. PERKINS: It is on the back.
Okay. And you're going to get a chance to look at
those. And, as you look at these cute little kids,
I want to make sure that you look at the
defendant's hair, because that's really the
probative that's what these pictures were
entered into evidence to talk about. Okay. They
were here to talk about his hair.
Now, I used to have my hair down actually,
had an afro like this. It this year too, as a
matter of fact. And I was thinking, I wish that I
still had my hair
MR. HARTLEY: Judge, I object to
what her personal opinion about her hair was.
THE COURT: I'm going to sustain.
You don't need to go into your hair.
MS. PERKINS: Well, what I'll do
then, is show because because we need to
know, as ladies as members of the jury, what
length someone's hair can be for you to be able to
twist it. Okay. That's an issue here. That's the
issue in the case. Everybody is saying he had his
hair this length and he didn't wear a twist. The
defendant is saving I mean the victim is saving

he had twists. And we have another witness in here

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

saying that he had twists at the time. So what length can your hair be to twist it? Now, I -- I was saying this earlier, and I did this -- and I want to scoot this out of the way -- to prove a point. And I tried to do it on this side so that you could see using the victim's hair. Now, this hair is really, really low, what you would consider low. And I believe this -- and I'm definitely no expert in twisting hair -- but I'm doing this to show you what length you can twist somebody's hair. And I want you to see that even at -- and this is how you twist hair. It's a demonstration of what it is. And I did these three to show you. And even at the length his hair is right now, if I went around his head doing each one of those little things, it would be able to be twists. And that's important, members of the jury, because this is what one considered to be -- sorry for doing your head -- but this is what one considered to be a low haircut, definitely. Definitely, a lot lower than what you see on these pictures. And I don't know if you all can see it from -- good from over here, but if you turn -turn around just a little bit, so they can see. You see how those little -- they end up being --

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

and what you do when you're growing dreadlocks, you keep on twisting and twisting and they grow out longer. But, at this length, you can twist them up -- twist your hair up, have that style, wash them out and have another hairstyle. If his hair can be twisted at this length, surely, members of the jury, his hair could be twisted at this length. And you're going to look on these pictures and see the difference in between how thick his hair is on these pictures and how -- how low his hair is on those pictures. And I think we had to see that to get a good look at that. Because, without somebody in here with twists or with hair long enough to be twisted, we know it's real easy for people to get confused about that unless you know people with twists or know how that works. So this is an extreme example. His hair is really low. If you can twist his hair, surely you can twist this.

Members of the jury, Larry -- Larry Copeland saw this defendant out there that night with twists in his hair. He saw him come up to him with Jamar Brown, and Jamar Brown put a gun to his head and took his property. He saw this defendant hold that young boy that was walking with him. He went and he called the police. They developed him as a

suspect. He identified him in a photo lineup. All of the defense witnesses have been willing to identify his hair that he didn't wear twists. He didn't wear twists. We already know that even with the length of his hair at the length that they say it is, it could have been twisted, because I've just showed you that. I just twisted way -- hair way shorter than that. These are his family members, members of the jury. You get to judge the credibility of witnesses and what bias they have and what interest in this case. They are his family members.

The only person that came in here with something besides those twists was the mother of his children. And she was not there during that night to say that he was there. She cannot put him there. She can only say what he does generally. She cannot say what he did on the night in question, because she was not there. So he doesn't have an alibi, because he can't -- she can't put him there. Nobody says that but him. And does he have motive to say, Yeah, I was there? Yes, he does. He has motive to lie. Where does the truth lie? Where does the truth lie? If you really weed through everything, the only thing he's saying, I

wasn't there. I was at home by myself with a six-pack of beer, baby-sitting my kids, and that -- and he's saying I had twists, but I didn't have twists.

And we had somebody that come in, we have to get in touch with that knows him, totally unrelated -- they said, yeah I know him, but I saw him before and he had twists. And I saw him with Jamar Brown. Someone who doesn't -- is not a relative, is not a family member. And, yeah, he does have a prior felony. He's out on the street. He has one just like Kourtney Greenwood does. I've seen them around. I've seen him in the neighborhood. And I've seen his hair, and I saw him on that particular day and he had twists in his hair. What interest does he have? That's what this case comes down to, members of the jury. Was he there? And the evidence shows, members of the jury, that he was there.

Why did this victim pick him out randomly? If he wasn't there, where would he just make his name up from? He was there. He is the one that assisted in the commission of this crime.

MR. HARTLEY: Your Honor, District Attorneys, counsel.

2

3

4

5

6

7

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

1.7

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Members of the jury, I want to thank you for being our jury today. I have to admit that there have been some stumbles along the way as far as getting this case to flow as smoothly as we like them to. Some of it was my fault. Some are witnesses fault. Some things like that. I really want to apologize, because I like to keep a case moving. And this has been one that did not move as I hope they always would be. So I apologize to that for you. And I apologize if, in any way you've been inconvenienced because of that, take it out on me or complain to the Bar Association about me or whatever, but don't take it out on my client. I don't think that you would, but it's just been sort of a hit and miss type thing getting this case up here into the jury stance.

Let me talk about a number of topics that I think are important before you, before you take this case to the jury -- I mean, to the jury room. I think that you're going to be faced with a very tough decision about guilt or innocence, because the stakes are high. This is an important case.

Later, right after I -- Ms. Perkins finishes her second portion of her closing statement, you'll get the charges of the law. And Judge Greenhaw

7.

will give you a set of legal standards and principles that apply to this case. She'll define robbery again. She'll define what an accomplice is for you. She'll give you some legal language to test the burden of proof, which is beyond a reasonable doubt. And she'll tell you what a reasonable doubt is. And she'll tell you about Mr. Greenwood's being -- having a presumption of innocence. All those things you will need to listen to very, very closely. Because, if -- that would be like the -- sort of your guidebook to consider the evidence within those parameters.

I submit to you that when you do that, you will have good reason for finding him not guilty.

And I want to try to hit every point that I can think of in regard to some serious weaknesses in the State's case and what I submit to you are some good points in the defense case.

Mr. Greenwood wrote me a note and it said that he thinks this case stands -- this case stands for this proposition, that possibly an innocent man can be sent to prison because of the possibility that he could have had twists in his hair. I think, in a way, he's correct on that. But I think there's a whole lot more to it that what that -- is contained

2.

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

in that statement. This case really -- I mean, maybe there is a question about whether he could have had twists in his hair or not. I guess I could have had twists in my hair. But look at what contradicts that evidence. I submit to you that these photographs contradict the victim's claim that the person who was involved had twists in his hair, not because they show necessarily that his hair is too short to have twists, but because these photographs clearly show that he, on more than one occasions, is there are photographic evidence to show what his hairstyle was. It's almost like the State is trying to make a case, say, Hey, he put these twists in his hair so that somebody wouldn't recognize him. Well, Hey, if he wanted to do that, why wouldn't he wear something over his face or put something, like a -- sunglasses -- I mean no sunglasses, not at night -- but something. If you're going to go to that trouble, why wouldn't you put something around his head to shade his face? Why would you just twist your hair to mislead somebody? That's a fallacious argument, because I think anyone in this courtroom would admit that if he had twists, they had to be little bitty short twists like this -- little bitty short

twists.

1.8

And remember what Mr. Copeland's testimony was? This guy named Jamar Brown approached him and came up to him and stuck a gun in his face and was demanding that he, you know, submit to a robbery. What, if you looked over here in the dark, would you -- and you're far away from me and him, would the first thing that you would notice and the only thing that you would notice would be possibly twists in somebody's hair? Would that be what you would notice about somebody while a gun is sticking in your face? Your focus would be so acutely focused -- your attention would be so acutely focused on that gun, you couldn't tell if it was lighting outside at that time. But be that as it may, that's what he said.

Okay. All right. Let's see if he's -- if you give him that ability, then let's figure something else out. Then that means that he's a pretty observant person who is capable in the crux of a very tragic moment -- or what do you call it -- traumatic moment, he's able to absorb details and remember facts. That's what -- that's what that would be a conclusion about him. All right. One of the things that we can present to you this

2.2

afternoon is that there is a lack of evidence in the case. Okay. I'm going to tell you where the lack of evidence is. Here's a man who claims he can identify somebody under those circumstances, but can't even tell you the last name or the --where a person lives, who he's known for eight or nine years and was with him on that night. Now, how can you be so smart in one situation and so incapable of giving information about a key material witness? Not only a witness, a victim. A thirteen-year-old boy.

Hundreds of thirteen year olds have testified in courtrooms. They are considered competent. There's not even a question as to their competency, unless they were mentally retarded or something. They would be competent witnesses. He's certainly an eyewitness to this case. He was right there in the middle of it. Remember, this man who could make the perfect identification, couldn't tell you Serillo's last name.

What was he doing with this kid out there that night? Maybe the reason is he was doing something he shouldn't have been doing. He was up to something. He didn't want -- he didn't want that kid to be able to come in and be questioned about

what in the heck they were doing. What do you do with a thirteen-year-old kid at 11:30 at night on Tuesday night, a weeknight, who's not your job, no blood relationship to you? And he said he was going to a -- he said he was going to a girlfriend's house is where he was headed. There's something wrong. There's something wrong to that.

He -- and what -- and what it is, that's one of the witnesses that we need here. I mean, why wouldn't this person be here to back up his identification. That person was closer to whoever it is than he was. So they've got a big lack of evidence. So this is a man who can positively identify somebody eight days later out of a group of six. Where is your photo lineup? You know, one out of six odds, you know, that ain't bad odds. I mean, you can pick somebody out of here. What the heck, they're all very similar. That's what a photo lineup is supposed to do, just pick somebody out. This will be available to you, I believe. We have admitted it, I believe.

Okay. That's the lack of evidence. This thing took place at night. Identification of people at night is more difficult than the daytime. We don't know what the lighting was out there. I

2.2

think he said it was near a street light. I don't care what the deal was. 11 o'clock at night is one thing and daytime is another thing. It's hard to identify at night.

Now, another thing I want to address for a moment or two is his demeanor. One of the things that you gauge as jurors is credibility. You are a test -- sort of a polygraph, I guess you might call it, a selective polygraph. And you are supposed to use your common -- commonsense knowledge -- or whatever you want to call it -- your general knowledge of how people behave, how people act, and how people are presenting themselves when they are testifying. I suggest to you that Mr. Copeland was a little nervous, most disjointed witness that he could possibly be.

I was making a note, and I was going to tell you that this is the whatever case or the you know case. You know, we were out there, you know, whatever, you know, you know. He must have used whatever about a hundred times in his testimony.

And it -- It's kind of hard to even follow him.

Now, I'm going to bring up three more -- three witnesses to contrast that to. We had

Deven Greenwood, sister and Lavan Howard. They

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

23

24

25

were consistent in their testimony about his hair. Now, some of you might say, Well, you know, she -it's his blood kin. You know, they'll come in here and they'll testify to anything. Well, ask yourself: Did they look like they were lying? Were they nervous when they were testifying? Did they -- did they -- were they inconsistent with, you know, with what each other said? Or were they giving you what appeared to be an honest statement of what they knew about their brother's hair -well, not brother, of course, not from Lavan Howard. But the two girls were his brother -- his sister. And she was his, you know, like a husband -- like a wife for a period of time. I ask you to -- to give -- give weight to what you think their credibility is.

I also would say that you should take his -the way he testified and his demeanor and his
posture in this case -- or his poise in this case
as a witness. I think he testified to you with the
sincerity that you would expect to come from
someone.

Now, what -- what -- how strong is the State's case? They've got a witness who has got a little bit of a suspect story about who his

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

thirteen-year-old friend was, who's out there doing something that we ain't -- we're not sure. were wandering around out there that night going to see somebody, who was allegedly the victim of a robbery and the person that robbed him, apparently, is Jamar Brown. The State argues that the second person was participating in the robbery. I didn't hear that much in the participating. But that's not the thrust of our case. If you think that there was a second person out there and that person was participating, okay. I'm submitting to you that the State hasn't proved that he was out there. But, the person that stuck the gun to his face, I ask you to remember was Jamar Brown. That person has been identified. I believe he, in fact, has pled guilty to this offense.

When you add the witnesses of the State's case, which I submit to you, I have outlined for you -- and, of course, you can make your own assessment. I may have overlooked something. I think important testimony was Lavan Howard was confident or sure that on Tuesday nights in April she was going to work and going to her second job and that she routinely had him at home baby-sitting. I submit to you these photographs

are at least consistent with a man who has a relationship with his children, who is affectionate with his children, who would be the type that would assume that responsibility and baby-sit on occasions as needed.

The State tried to bring in one -- one of their rebuttal witness, a man, himself, whose testimony didn't come across all that sterling and is a convicted robber himself. I submit to you that that testimony travels rather weak. I don't know how he would be able to tell, after such a long period of time, he's got twists in his hair. I don't know how that would be -- that would be hard to remember that. What would be important about that? But he said it.

I will ask you -- I will leave you with this question. And I think that Mr. Greenwood did make an important point when he said, could somebody have had twists in his hair? I don't think that's the real issue. I think it -- what -- what's the strength of this man's testimony? And how could he not have told the police who the other victim was who would have been the witness that could make or break this case? When he left that out, I think he gunned his own case down. Long hair, short hair,

. 8

1.7

afro, corn rolls -- or whatever those -dreadlocks, or whatever, that's all, to me, less
important than the fact that he didn't identify
this kid with enough specificity that a police
officer -- and believe me, they can find people.
They've got investigators to go out and find
somebody. All you've got to do is say I've got a
witness that lives at such and such address. They
can -- they've got police cars roaming this city
looking for witnesses all the time.

Now, anybody -- you might get back there and say, Well, you know, it's the police officer's fault -- Mr. Bruce -- Buce. He should have done something. Well, if he did, he should have done it is right, and maybe we would have some testimony from that person. But, he took -- you know, they could have done it. But he could have given the information or Buce could have sought the information. Either way, it is a weakness or a lack of evidence on the State's side.

In summary, I'll say to you this, that the evidence, as it stands today, does not prove him guilty of anything beyond a reasonable doubt. It leaves us room for substantial doubt. We submit to you that a proper assessment of the juror -- of the

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

evidence in this case will justify a reasonable doubt. But to -- hand in hand with that goes his presumption of innocence. It doesn't matter that he's been convicted of something before. It doesn't matter -- he took the stand and admitted to his prior transgression. But he's still presumed innocent. And I ask you to take that presumption back there and give it its due weight. Then stack up the evidence and stack up what the defense said in regard to how he always kept his hair and never had those twists or whatever, and ask yourself, am I convinced beyond a reasonable doubt of his guilt. I submit to you that I -- that that's not a reasonable -- or not -- or not the reasonable finding of this trial. A reasonable finding is there's a doubt. The State didn't pass that -that standard of proof. That standard is so high, and it sometimes said that if a -- if a District Attorney proves that it was possible that somebody is guilty, that's not beyond a reasonable doubt. If they prove that it's probable that they're guilty, it's not beyond a reasonable doubt. It is a standard above possible -- beyond possible and beyond probable. It's got to exclude all reasonable doubt. That is a high standard, and we

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

just ask you to listen to the Judge when she delineates it to you in her jury charge. And then, under that standard, we ask you to find Mr. Greenwood not guilty. Thank you.

MS. PERKINS: Counsel.

Mr. Hartley was just talking about reasonable doubt. I think a good question -- if I was sitting there, I would be asking what is reasonable doubt. You know, what does that mean? And reasonable doubt is a doubt -- it's an actual doubt. Okay. It's not a suspicion or guess or a possibility of a doubt. It's an actual doubt. It's a doubt that arises from the evidence or the lack of evidence. like Mr. Hartley said. But it's an actual doubt. It's not something that you're just sitting here saying, Um, I wonder about that, but, you know, there's nothing that you can point to, you know, from the evidence that's reasonable, where you can actually get that particular doubt. I want you to be clear about what that is, and I hope I've cleared that up for you. It's not a surmise. not a guess. It's not a speculation, well, such and such and such maybe. Your doubt has to be reasonable and it has to arise from the evidence or the lack of evidence.

Okay. Now, there's one thing, as I was sitting there, I wanted everybody to keep in mind. You know, this guy's testimony and about this guy's. This is a victim of a robbery. This is a -- this man -- this is a guy that was walking down the street and had a gun put to his head and had property taken from him. He's a person. When this happened to him on April the 9th of 2002, it was near a street light. That's what his testimony said. And he got a good look at the two people that was standing there in front of him. One of those persons was Jamar Brown, who put a gun to his head. And the other one was Kourtney Greenwood that held the little boy.

And I want to go back and talk about the law for the second. Okay. If he didn't put the gun to his head, why is he charged with this offense?

That's a good question. There's a law in the State of Alabama. And, again, that's why I asked you, would you be willing to follow this law, not what you think would be the law and not what you saw on Law and Order last night -- or you're going to see tomorrow night. I think tomorrow is Wednesday -- tomorrow night. Okay.

The law, aiding and abetting says, if you

assist somebody in the participation of a crime, then you're just as guilty as the person who did it. Okay. So if I'm driving a car and you go in there and rob the gas station -- and I'm the get away car driver -- you run out, and I get in the car and I drive off, yeah, they're going to charge with me breaking in that place and taking the stuff, just like they charged you, even though I didn't go in there and do it. So whoever the person is that was standing there holding that little boy is just as guilty as Jamar Brown even though he didn't put a gun to his head, because he was assisting him.

Now, who is the person that was standing there with Jamar Brown when Jamar Brown put the gun to his head? Members of the jury, it was

Kourtney Greenwood. What evidence has there been that he was not there? An alibi by his baby's mom who comes in today. If you know -- and think about it, members of the jury -- if she knew that the father of her children was charged with something and she knew -- she knew he was charged back then. She said he called home and said he was charged with a crime and you knew they didn't do it and you

had evidence --

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. HARTLEY: Judge, I object. I think this is improper argument. I don't think it creates a burden on him or anybody to create a defense.

THE COURT: I'm going to sustain it in that line. But you can rephrase that.

MS. PERKINS: Okay. If she knew -if she knew, this woman that took this witness stand -- and I questioned her about it and I asked her, Wouldn't that be important information, if you -- if she knew he was innocent, the father of her children that she doesn't want to see go to jail -- if she knew that he wasn't there, that he was somewhere else at the time, you don't think she would have gone and told the police that? She came in here and testified today. If she knew that back then -- well, they didn't come to me. How are they supposed to know? You've got evidence that this man is innocent. You know that he's charged with a crime, why don't you go down there and tell them? Why didn't you call the DA office? Why didn't you do something? But she didn't, members of the jury. First time you hear about that is in here today. That's it. She had information on this guy's

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

innocence she could have told the police, yeah, detective, it would have been true. But, no, we get it after the facts, where there can't be no investigation about that. We can't investigate that. No, we're already here. Because if I had would have come back and told you then, you could have gone and checked out all this stuff. But, now, I can't check nothing out, because this is the moment of truth, so I'll come in and tell it now. Convenient. That's the kicker, because that's his alibi. I wasn't there. I was at home with a six-pack of beer and my kids watching a movie. only preservation of that alibi is the baby's mother saying, I was at work. She wasn't there. But she comes in with that testimony to corroborate his testimony today when nothing can be done to check it out. When she could have done it back then, she knew he was charged and it could have been investigated and find it true, we never would have got to this point. That's convenient. And, members of the jury, he does not have an

And, members of the jury, he does not have an alibi, because that is not credible. That is not credible. Why -- how else do we know that he wasn't there? Well, because Mr. Greenwood said that the person that was there had twists. And he

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

never wears his hair like this. It's always in a short little afro. Okay. We already know that a short afro can be twists, you know. Nodding your head like that, send an innocent man to jail with twists -- because of twists. He's not going no where because of no twists. Twists is not an issue. The issue is, Were you standing there when a gun was put to this man's head?

We've already decided that the alibi is not credible. Could he have had twists? Who are the people that said he didn't have twists? Sister. Sister. Well, who is the person that came in, person from the community, not the sister, not the cousin, not nothing, just somebody we could get when they came up that we knew that knew him and said, Okay. You know this quy. Have you seen him? Have you seen him with twists before? Yeah, I saw him with twists. Have you seen him with Jamar Brown before? Yeah, I've seen him with Jamar Brown. He don't have no connection. He's not a cousin, family member, or nothing. He comes up here -- I put him on for that limited purpose, because that was the issue. And the time is far spent. The issue is everybody is up here saying that this guy doesn't have twists and that he said

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

he don't know Jamar Brown. Have you seen him with Jamar Brown? Yes I have. Have you seen him with twists? Yes I have. Who is more credible? Does he have a felony? Yes, he does.

Does he have a felony? Yes, he does. That makes it more credible to me, because he's out there where he is and sees him around. He hangs around. He didn't say, I know him. I'm not his boy. I'm not his best friend. I don't hang out with him. He's not somebody that I, you know, go shoot basketball with or whatever, but I know of him. I know of him. And it's reasonable to know of somebody. If I know of you of my community, even though I haven't talked to you, I'm qualified to testify about what I've seen you like. You all are qualified to testify about what you've seen my hair like once you've left here, because you've seen me. Did her hair look like that? Yeah, I saw it. And just because you don't know me or you haven't hung out with me, does that mean that your testimony is any less credible about what you saw my hair look like? You saw me. And his testimony is more credible, because he don't have a reason to sit up here and lie about it. He ain't no family member. He ain't got no connection. He's just

innocent.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Now, let's talk about Serillo. And I want to sav this -- and I don't know if this is a culture thing -- but it's legitimate to bring up, because Mr. Hartley has made it an issue. It is very reasonable in African/American communities for you to know people by their nicknames and know them in the streets and not know their last name from your neighborhood. I just know this little kid that's out in the street. I saw him out there when I was walking down the street. I was, like, Hey, little kid, come with me. Didn't know his last name. think there is a lack of evidence as far as why the police didn't investigate that. I don't have no problem admitting, I can't make up evidence that's not there. It is so not there. It is just totally But is that reasonable doubt enough to acquit this man for what he did when we have everything else lined up and his defense doesn't buy.

And you know what, if you consider that it is, then do what you got to do. Let him go. Even though he was there when this man put this gun to his head and the law holds him guilty. He said he didn't want that little boy to get involved,

1.3

because he hated he had told him to come with him and got him involved with this any way. He told the police his name. Didn't follow up on him, because he -- he hated that he put him in that situation anyway. He saw them both. He identified them both. His looked at them both. His alibi doesn't wash up, because it's not quivocal. It comes in here when it can't be investigated. And he could have had twists in his hair. And have somebody say that he did have twists in his hair about that point. So that destroys the credibility of their witnesses.

That's what this case comes down to, members of the jury. And you really do have a serious decision to make. You have to weigh the evidence. And you have to weigh what happened out there. We know that it was a robbery. We know, by law, that whoever the person that was out there with Jamar Brown when Jamar Brown put this gun to his head, we know that whoever was out there is guilty just the same as Jamar Brown. The question for you all to consider is, Is this the man that was out there with Jamar Brown? The victim says he got a good look at him. He identified him, and he identified Jamar Brown. Identified him then,

identified him in a photo lineup, and he identified him today. What says that he's not there? His alibi, which we know is not credible. And number two, the fact that the person he identified had twists and his family says he doesn't have twists. That's the only two things that are not there. His alibi is not credible. We know that he could have had twists and we have a good identification.

He was there, members of the jury. And he needs to be found guilty -- just as guilty as the person that put that gun to his head. We know that you will render the only fair and just verdict in this case, which is a verdict of guilt.

THE COURT: Let me ask. It's right at five o'clock, I'd rather you be fresh -- but if you want to stay, let's --

(Jurors nod.)

THE COURT: Okay. I see -- it will be a good time to take a break. What time do y'all want to come back in the morning? In the morning, I'll charge you, and my part won't take as long as theirs. But what time, 8:30 or 9:00? You're in charge now. 9:00 or --

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: 8:30.

```
THE COURT: 8:30. Good. We'll --
1
                      PROSPECTIVE JUROR: 7:30.
2
                      THE COURT: Now, y'all need to start
3
      agreeing, so -- but 8:30 in the morning. And we'll
4
      get you in the jury assembly room. And, again,
5
       I'll caution you not to discuss the case. And if
6
      anybody at home asks you about it, just say the
7
      Judge said I can't talk about it. So we'll see you
8
       in morning.
9
                      (Out of the presence of the jury.)
10
                      THE COURT: Mr. Hartley --
11
                      MR. HARTLEY: I'm sorry. I was
12
       getting distracted, Judge.
13
                      THE COURT: I think he wants to say
14
       something, but I don't want him to say it
15
       without --
16
                      MR. HARTLEY: I think it was kind of
17
       like the jury argument, Judge, I believe is what
18
       it's leading to.
19
                      THE DEFENDANT: (Defendant nods.)
20
                      MR. HARTLEY: Oh, okay.
21
                      THE DEFENDANT: I just wanted to say
22
       a couple of things to you, Ms. Greenhaw, and
23
       whoever else is in here. If I had any part of
24
       doing this or knew anything about it, I would have
25
```

```
been told -- okay, Ms. Greenhaw, I know what you're
 1
       fixing to do -- but I don't know Mr. Brown. And I
 2
       don't know Mr. Copeland --
 3
                      THE COURT: Well, you know --
 5
                      THE DEFENDANT: I don't know
       Mr. Franklin.
 6
                      THE COURT: -- you've testified to
 7
       that, and it's going to be up to the jury. You
 8
       know, that's what it comes down to. And none of us
 9
       have any control over that.
10
                      THE DEFENDANT: I just don't want to
11
       be in no situation like that that I don't know
12
       nothing about.
13
                      THE COURT: Okay.
14
15
                      MR. HARTLEY: Judge, what time did
       they decide to come back?
16
17
                      THE COURT: 8:30.
18
                      (Break for the day.)
                      (In the presence of the jury.)
19
20
                      THE COURT: Good morning.
21
                      (Jurors respond.)
                      THE COURT: Now, we need to lock
22
       that back door. I don't want everyone coming in
23
       and out. Everyone that's in here, you've got to
24
25
       stay in here. You cannot leave while I'm charging
```

the jury. And you need to be seated.

THE DEFENDANT: Ms. Greenhaw, can I say something, please?

THE COURT: No. You need to say it to your attorney. Now, I'm getting ready to charge the jury.

It's now my duty to explain to you the law that will guide you in your deliberations. We all appreciate how carefully you've been listening.

And I know you'll continue to do so. I'm going to go slow, because unfortunately in the State of Alabama, you're not permitted to have a copy of my charge to take with you to deliberation room. Now, I disagree with the law in that respect, but I must follow it and so must you.

Now, this case is brought to you by an indictment which charges Kourtney Greenwood with Robbery in the First Degree. I want you to understand, from the beginning, that the indictment here has no bearing whatsoever on the guilt or innocence of any person. It is not evidence in the case. It's merely the paperwork or legal process by which the case is presented for trial.

Now, as to this charge, the defendant has pled not guilty. A plea of not guilty places the burden

on the State of Alabama to prove by the evidence the guilt of defendant beyond a reasonable doubt. So before a conviction can be had, each of you must be satisfied beyond a reasonable doubt of his guilt. Otherwise, he's entitled to an acquittal.

Furthermore, the defendant is presumed to be innocent. And that presumption attends him until his guilt is established from the evidence beyond a reasonable doubt. This presumption of innocence is evidence in the case and is to be considered by you along with all the other evidence. It's a fact which is to be considered by you and goes with the defendant to your verdict unless the evidence convinces you beyond a reasonable doubt of the prudent --

THE DEFENDANT: Ms. Perkins.

Ms. Perkins, why don't you go on and tell them what --

THE COURT: Now, wait just --

THE DEFENDANT: -- what Jamar Brown told you yesterday? That dude told you he didn't know me.

THE COURT: Okay. I'm going to have the jury go out. If you'll take --

THE DEFENDANT: He told you he

didn't know me. 1 THE COURT: -- them into the jury 2. deliberation room? 3 THE DEFENDANT: He told you he didn't know me, Ms. Perkins. Why don't you tell 5 6 the jury that, Ms. Perkins. Don't lie. This is my life on the line. 7 THE COURT: Mr. --8 . THE DEFENDANT: An innocent man can 9 go to prison for nothing. 10 THE COURT: Mr. Greenwood --11 THE DEFENDANT: Tell them, Ms. 12 Perkins. An innocent man can go to prison for 13 nothing, Ms. Perkins. Please tell the jury that. 14 Please tell the jury that, Ms. Perkins. That man 15 told y'all he didn't know me yesterday. 16 THE COURT: Mr. Greenwood -- and I 17 don't want to say it in front of the jury -- he 18 19 needs to stay out here. THE BAILIFF: Okay. 20 THE COURT: Is the door closed? 21 THE COURT REPORTER: Not yet, Judge. 22 (Out of the presence of the jury.) 23 THE COURT: Mr. Greenwood, you have 24 25 the right to stay in the courtroom if you conduct

```
yourself in a proper manner. If you do not, you
1
      will not be allowed to stay in the courtroom. Now,
2
      I can cite you, at this time, for being in direct
3
      criminal contempt of court. However, in light of
4
      vour other sentence -- a life sentence, I don't
5
      think that that's worth my time. So I want to know
6
      now whether you're going to stay in here and remain
7
      silent. If not, we'll make arrangements so you can
 8
      hear my charge.
9
                      MS. PERKINS: Judge, the State is
10
       going to ask for a mistrial. I mean, that's
11
12
       information that the jury was not supposed to hear.
13
                      THE COURT: I didn't hear what all
14
       he said.
                      MS. PERKINS: He said, Why don't you
15
       tell him what Mr. Jamar Brown said? Don't hold --
16
                      THE DEFENDANT: He told y'all -- he
17
       told y'all yesterday he didn't know me --
18
                      THE COURT: Mr. Greenwood --
19
                      THE DEFENDANT: Ms. Perkins.
20
                      THE COURT: What did he say, Ms. --
21
                      THE DEFENDANT: I need a lawyer,
22
       Mama. Get me a lawyer. Don't let them do me like
23
       this, please.
24
                      THE COURT: Okay. I'm citing him
25
```

```
for -- we'll make arrangements for -- to have some
1
      way for him to hear it.
2
           Tell the jury there's going to be a slight
3
4
       delay and they can take about an hour break. We're
      going to have to make some adjustments. Take him
5
      back there.
6
                      THE DEFENDANT: Why y'all going to
7
       let them do me like this? Make sure they know
8
       what's going on, Mama. Make sure --
9
                      THE COURT: Take them out the back
10
1.1
       way.
                      THE DEFENDANT: -- they know what's
12
13
       going on. That dude told her -- ask her.
14
                      (Out of the presence of the
15
                      defendant.)
                      THE COURT: I'm going to find out if
16
       Mr. Merrill -- we don't have a monitor, do we?
17
                      (Out of the presence of jury.)
18
                      THE COURT: Mr. Greenwood, the Court
19
       had indicated before -- and I will state again.
20
       You will not be able to stay in the courtroom when
21
       I'm charging the jury. I also want to correct
22
23
       myself. I had indicated I would not hold you in
       contempt because you had a life sentence. You do
24
       not have a life sentence. That was someone last
25
```

week. So the Court will warn you again that you would be subject to contempt. You're going to be taken back to the jury deliberation room. You will be able to hear everything that goes on in there. There will be deputies with you. If you have any outbursts that can be heard in here, then you will be gagged.

So, at this time -- and it will take probably about five minutes to get the jury together. But, whenever, you can take him back there.

THE BAILIFF: Yes, ma'am.

(In the presence of the jury.)

THE COURT: I'm sorry about the delay. But now I'm going to continue charging you.

And I had previously charged you that the indictment is not evidence and that the State has the burden of proof and that the defendant is presumed to be innocent. And that is a fact which is to be considered by you and goes with your -- with the defendant to your verdict unless the evidence convinces you beyond a reasonable doubt of each and every element of the offense here.

Now, you've heard the term reasonable doubt mentioned. It's a relative term. And it's not always easy to define. But, basically, a

reasonable doubt, it's a fair doubt based upon reason and common sense arising from the evidence. In short, it's a doubt for which you can assign a reason that comes from the evidence. Now, a reasonable doubt may arise not only from the evidence produced, but also from a lack of evidence or any part of the evidence.

Now, the law tells us this about the term reasonable doubt. It's not just a mere possible doubt. In other words, it is not a mere guess, surmise, or capricious doubt. The doubt which would justify an acquittal, it must be an actual doubt. The reasonable doubt which entitles an accused to an acquittal, it's not fanciful -- fanciful, vague, conjectural, or speculative. But, again, it's a reasonable doubt arising from the evidence and remaining after a careful consideration of the testimony such as men and women such as you would consider under all the circumstances.

Now, the State is not required to convince you of defendant's guilt beyond all doubt or to a mathematical certainty. Again, it's beyond a reasonable doubt. I told you earlier that you're the sole judges of the evidence, and I'm going to

remind you or explain to you again what is and what is not evidence. First, the indictment, as I said, it is not evidence. In addition, the arguments, statements, or assertions or demonstrations of the attorneys, that is not evidence. Rulings made by the Court during the course of the trial, that is not evidence. Evidence is simply the testimony of witnesses under oath from the witness stand, any exhibits or documents that were actually admitted and any presumptions of law that I've given you, such as the presumption of innocence.

Just as you're the judges of the evidence, you're also the sole and exclusive judges of the credibility of witnesses and the weight that should be given their testimony. In passing on the credibility of a witness, you have the right to consider any bias, interest, or prejudice that may have been exhibited to you while that person was testifying. You also can consider the demeanor of the witness on the stand. That is, how did they appear to you while they were testifying? You also can consider the basis for their testimony. That is, how did they know the facts to which they testified? Did they have an opportunity to see, hear, just how did they know or learn those facts?

Now, the defendant in this case has testified in his own behalf, and he has a perfect right to do so. And you cannot capriciously disregard his testimony any more than that of any other witness. The law is that you must take his testimony in the case and consider it along with all the other testimony. But while you are evaluating his testimony, you may also take into consideration his interest in the outcome of the case.

In addition in evaluating the testimony of any witness, you can consider whether or not that person has prior convictions. However, with regard to the defendant, you may only consider them in assessing his credibility in this case. You cannot assume that just because he has been convicted of a prior offense that he may have committed this offense. That's not permissible as you may only consider a prior conviction in evaluating credibility.

Now, the defendant here also asserted the defense of alibi. That is to say that he was at another place when this offense was committed. The burden of proof does not shift to the defendant when he undertakes to advance an alibi defense.

Rather you're to consider the evidence of his alibi

2.

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

1.8

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

with all the other evidence. And if you have reasonable doubt as to the guilt of the defendant, then you would find him not guilty.

There's also been an issue raised regarding identification. The reliability of eyewitness identification is an issue and deserves your attention when evaluating the credibility of the witness testifying to the identification. And you're to consider it as you would the testimony of any other witness. In addition to that, you're to consider whether or not the witness had an adequate opportunity at the time of the offense to observe the person or hear the person. Also, you can consider the circumstances under which the victim or the eyewitness observed the person. The -- such things as the length of time, the visibility, distance, lighting. You can consider those type of conditions. If you have a reasonable doubt as to the identity of the defendant as to the person who committed the offense, then you would find the defendant not guilty.

Now, in Alabama there is a law which is called aiding and abetting. And the law in Alabama is that a person is legally accountable for the behavior of another person constituting an offense

if with intent to promote or assist the commission of the crime, he aids or abets such other person in committing the crime. And there's no distinction between principles and accessories in the commission of the offense. And an accessory is just as liable for that offense as the principal. Aid and abet comprehends all assistance rendered by acts or words of encouragement, support or presence, actual or constructive to render assistance should it become necessary. However, mere presence, without giving aid or encouragement at or before the commission of the offense, does not constitute aiding and abetting.

With regard to this particular offense, as you know, the defendant is charged with robbery in the first degree. Under the law of Alabama, a person commits the offense of robbery in the first degree, if he, in the course of committing a theft uses or threatens the imminent use of force against the person of the owner of the property or any person present, with the intent to overcome that person's physical resistance, and, in doing so, is armed with a deadly weapon. So in order to convict, the State must prove beyond a reasonable doubt that the defendant, Kourtney Greenwood, committed or

attempted to commit or aided and abetted in the -in the attempt to take any type of property from
the victim. That in the course of committing or
attempting to commit or in aiding and abetting the
theft, the defendant used force against the person
with intent to overcome his physical resistance or
physical power to resist or threaten imminent use
of force against the person with intent to compel
acquiescence to the taking of the property and that
the defendant was armed with a deadly weapon or
aided and abetting while one was armed with a
deadly weapon. And here it would be a gun.

A person commits the crime of theft of property if he knowingly obtains or asserts unauthorized control over the property of another with intent to deprive the owner of his property. A deadly weapon is any firearm or anything manifestly designed or adapted for the purpose of inflicting death or serious physical injury. And a person acts intentionally with respect to a conduct when his purpose is to cause that result or to engage in that conduct. And a person acts knowingly with respect to conduct when he is aware that his conduct is of that nature or that the circumstance exists. And a deadly weapon can

include such items as a pistol.

21.

If you find from the evidence that the State has proved beyond a reasonable doubt each of the elements of the offense of robbery in the first degree, then you would find the defendant guilty as charged. On the other hand, if you find that the State has failed to prove one or more of the elements of robbery in the first degree, then you would find the defendant not guilty.

In a moment, you'll be beginning your deliberations. And, in passing on the evidence, you have the right to use your knowledge of people and their affairs. This is the tool that is given you, in which some of us simply call your common sense. In arriving at your verdict, you must not permit sympathy, prejudice, or emotion to influence you. Furthermore, you must not base your verdict upon any preconceived idea of what would be a popular or unpopular verdict. In other words, your verdict must strictly be based on the evidence presented in the courtroom and the law that applies.

Also, before you reach a verdict, all twelve of you must reach or agree on the same verdict. In other words, there can be no split verdict. It

must be unanimous.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

In a moment when you go back to the jury deliberation room, one of the first things you need to do is to select one person to act as your spokesperson or your foreperson. Now, that person will have no greater weight in your deliberations than anyone else, but will simply act as your spokesperson. You need to discuss the case. And if you have any questions -- and there's paper and pencil back there -- have the foreperson write out the question, sign. And if it's a question of law, I will answer it. However, if it's a question of fact, I cannot assist you, as you're the sole and exclusive judges of the facts. Once you have reached a verdict, have the foreperson sign the verdict form, and you'll be brought back into the courtroom and it will be read in the courtroom.

The verdict form is very simple, and there's a place for you to check. And it's we, the jury, find the defendant guilty of robbery in the first degree as charged in the indictment. Or we, the jury, find the defendant not guilty.

There's one last thing I must do. And I -- after you've been here for two days and waited a lengthy time -- but we found from past experience

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

1.3

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

when a case goes this long, and particularly into another day, it's always wise to have an alternate. And it's extremely important, because if the number reaches less than twelve, I would have to declare a mistrial and we would have to start all over. I'm sure you understand the importance of it. And it is not unusual for something to come up during the course of the trial. In fact, it happens more frequently than you can imagine, that a juror cannot continue serving as a juror. But, at this time, I'm going to -- the alternate is Eloise Wilkerson. And when the rest of you are taken, in a moment, back to the jury deliberation room, I'm going to have you stay in here. Now, the attorneys are real good about letting me know if I've misstated something or need to charge you further. What says the State? MS. PERKINS: State's satisfied, Judge. MR. HARTLEY: Satisfied, Judge. THE COURT: Okay. In just a moment, you'll be taken back to the deliberation room. Now, you're in charge of your time now. You can take breaks if you want to. If you want to go down

```
and get a Coke, you can do so. You also have your
 1
       own thermostat back there, so you're in charge --
 2
       it's either too hot or too cold in the courtroom.
 3
 4
            And, in just a moment, we'll get the exhibits
 5
       and they'll go back with you as well as the jury
 6
       verdict form. It will be just -- and there are
 7
       also restrooms back there. And it will be just a
 8
       moment.
 9
                      MS. PERKINS: Judge --
10
                      THE COURT: And let me say one last
11
       thing. I know you're aware that Mr. Greenwood is
12
       not in the courtroom. But you cannot infer
       anything prejudicial whatsoever by his not being
13
14
      present in the courtroom. Okay. So, if you'll --
15
                      MS. PERKINS: Judge, my coat is back
16
       there. Can I get it before they go back there?
17
                      THE COURT: Yeah.
18
                      MS. PERKINS: (Ms. Perkins
19
       complies.)
20
                      THE COURT: Okay. If all of you
21
       will --
22
                      (Alternate juror comes to the
                      bench.)
23
24
                      THE ALTERNATE: I'm sorry.
25
                      THE COURT: Okay.
```

(Out of the presence of the jury.) 1 THE COURT: I just wanted to tell 2 you how much we appreciate you serving. I know 3 it's been a long two days. The good news is you 4 are excused for the rest of the day. 5 THE ALTERNATE: Thank you. 6 THE COURT: But you would need to 7 call code-a-phone tonight, and they'll let you know 8 what to do about tomorrow or the rest of the week. 9 10 And it's up to you whether you want to talk to anybody about the case. 11 12 THE ALTERNATE: Thank you very much. THE COURT: Now, we need to bring 13 Mr. Greenwood back out and take up a few final 14 15 details. THE BAILIFF: You need him back out? 16 17 THE COURT: Yes. 18 (In the presence of the defendant.) 19 THE COURT: You were back in the 20 deliberation room the whole time? 21 THE BAILIFF: Yes, ma'am. 22 THE COURT: Mr. Greenwood, of 23 course, you were back in the deliberation room and we had a monitor back there. And I need to know, 24 were you able to hear the Judge's jury charge? 25

THE DEFENDANT: (Defendant nods.) 1 THE COURT: You need to --THE DEFENDANT: Yes. 3 THE COURT: Okav. And I think there 4 were deputies -- two deputies back there, and y'all 5 could hear it as well? 6 THE BAILIFF: Yes, ma'am. 7 THE COURT: I had -- the State had 8 hurriedly asked for a mistrial at one time. And, 9 let me just say this, I'm not going to let --10 MS. PERKINS: We withdraw that 11 12 motion. THE COURT: Okay. Well, I was going 13 to say, I don't think the conduct -- I'm not going 14 15 to let error be invited into the record. But you 16 withdraw? 17 MS. PERKINS: Yes, Judge. THE COURT: Now, Mr. Greenwood, I 18 got your letter or your note. And, of course, 19 20 you're still referring to Jamar Brown, and although, we went over some things yesterday, I 21 want to be sure it's in the Record. And 22 23 Mr. Brown's attorney, Mr. Durant, was here 24 yesterday and is here as well. And is there 25 anything anyone wants to say regarding Mr. Brown?

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. HARTLEY: I will start, Judge, by saying that, first of all, prior -- some time ago Mr. Brown had pled guilty in this matter. Yesterday morning, I talked to Mr. Durant before I went and spoke to Jamar Brown. I asked Mr. Durant if it was okay if I went and talked to him, because I had some information that said that he might testify in a way that would be beneficial for Kourtney Greenwood. I went to the jail yesterday morning and sat with Mr. Brown, explained to him my role in the case. I understood that he had already pled quilty. I don't think I had attended his guilty plea, so I asked him what he would be saying pertaining to Kourtney Greenwood's participation in the -- or lack of participation in the offense. I'll just summarize that he represented that he would be a witness for the defense. I then proceeded to the part of the jail where Mr. Greenwood was and told him. I said, I cleared it with Mr. Durant. I talked to Mr. Brown, and I think he's going to be a defense witness. THE DEFENDANT: State what --MR. HARTLEY: Well -- coming to your defense, stating that Kourtney Greenwood was not at the scene and that he was not acquainted with him.

21.

So, I advised the Judge's office that we were going to need him for a witness. A little later in the day, I believe -- I'm trying to remember who told me -- but a deputy or some court personnel told me that Mr. Brown was not -- had said something about not testifying. At that point, because I really did want his testimony, we had a meeting in the holding cell there that consisted of myself, Mr. Durant, Mr. Brown, Vernetta Perkins, and the District Attorney, Richard White. I think that was who all was there; is that right?

MS. PERKINS: (Attorney nods.)

MR. HARTLEY: Mr. Brown's

reservation seemed to be that he thought his testimony, if it was favorable for the defense, might adversely affect his sentence in the case, because he has not been -- he has not been sentenced yet -- in every way we thought was ethically and correct -- legally correct, we tried to admonish Mr. Brown to testify. We appealed to his attorney. We appealed to the DA's office to speak to him. All of that to no avail. And I really regret that, because I really -- really did want Mr. Brown's testimony.

THE COURT: And let me say in this

regard. We've had the transcript of Mr. Brown's plea -- and that's Court Exhibit A, and it's in the Record. And when the State was putting on its offer of proof, Mr. Greenwood, it was stated that he was with Mr. Brown on that occasion.

MR. HARTLEY: Of course, Judge, we think that that is what the Record says. We think that it is typical -- that was an offer from the State, and he just said yes to --

THE COURT: I'm just simply saying that that's part of the Record.

MR. HARTLEY: However, yesterday, he said he had told the State and told his attorney, and -- and made several references, he said that he had told them that Kourtney Greenwood was not there and he didn't know Kourtney Greenwood. He made that representation and led us to believe that it was on the Record. But he did say that that's what his position was, but he refused to testify as such in the trial.

THE COURT: Well, that was not on the Record, that --

MR. HARTLEY: Right. But it --

THE COURT: -- representation.

MR. HARTLEY: -- but he said that he

23

1

2.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

24

25

represented that to the DA's office.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

1.0

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MS. PERKINS: Judge, may I --

THE COURT: Yes.

MS. PERKINS: I have said on the record more than one time that Mr. Brown did tell myself and Mr. Durant again yesterday in front of Mr. Hartley. And I think we brought both of them out here. He did say -- and I have said it on the Record more than one time -- that he did tell me he did not know Kourtney Greenwood on the Record. the same time, when I did do the offer of proof, he did say, Yes -- yes, this is what the facts show. Don't know what he meant -- was not in his head -but, as we normally do the offer of proof, he accepted that in order to get his plea -- that version of the facts in order to get his plea of quilty. He did represent to me that he did not know -- did not know Mr. Greenwood. I was back there. Mr. Durant was back there. Mr. Hartley and Mr. White. I told Mr. Brown, as well, in presence of his attorneys and everybody else, that what the State wanted him to do was testify truthfully, then get on the witness stand, tell the truth and then there would be no problem. If he gets on the witness stand and lies, then that would be a

problem for me.

I told him that the State of Alabama does not do sentencing. The Court does sentencing. And all of that was communicated to him. Once we all had the conversation with him, he said that he did not want to testify. And that's what he decided. Was that because we had a witness here saying that they did know him. I don't know why that was. But he decided that he did not want to testify. And that's a decision that was made. That's where we stand.

MR. DURANT: And, Judge, may I add that after everyone had left, all of the attorneys, I spoke to Mr. Brown by myself. And I indicated to him that he was the one to make the decision, whether he was going to testify or not. That all we wanted him to do was --

MS. PERKINS: -- tell the truth.

MR. DURANT: -- to tell the truth.

And, at that time, he indicated to me that he did

not want to testify. And I -- I subscribe to what

everyone has said, he has -- he has, from the

outset, said he did not know Mr. Greenwood.

THE COURT: Okay. I just wanted all of this to be on Record.

MR. HARTLEY: And could I ask 1 Mr. Durant one question? 2 THE COURT: Yes. 3 MR. HARTLEY: Did he express a reservation because he thought it would affect his 5 sentence? 6 7 MR. DURANT: Yes, he did. 8 MS. PERKINS: But wasn't he communicated to -- and I want to clear this up for 9 10 the Record, because I don't want there to be any 11 confusion if there is an appeal or something. He 12 was told over and over by the Court, by myself, by Mr. Durant, and by you that none of us have any 13 effect on sentencing. There was no threats made to 14 15 him or promises on either way concerning his sentence. As a matter of fact, he was told that 16 the State of Alabama, out of my mouth in the 17 presence of both of you all, that the District 18 Attorney's office does not sentence. The Court 19 does that. And all the State of Alabama wanted him 20 to do was testify truthfully. 21 MR. DURANT: And I told him the same 22 thing when we were alone. 23 THE COURT: Okay. Well, that's all 24 25 for now.

THE DEFENDANT: Ms. Greenhaw, I 1 was -- when all this saying was going on, I was in 2 3 the little holding cell right there, listening and looking at everything. And I know what -- exactly 4 what they said. And he looked -- Mr. Brown looked 5 exactly at Ms. Perkins, and she leaned back and 6 7 looked at him, and said that -- he knew -- he said, I go to sentencing this week. I ain't fixing to go 8 in there in front of those folks like that, because 9 I go for sentencing. I know what y'all goin' try 10 to do. You know, what I'm saying. I know what's 11 going -- I ain't going in there like this. I ain't 12 going in there like this. 13 I'm standing right there in the holding cell 14 looking --15 16 THE COURT: Okay. Well, I think 17 everyone is -- there's not that much disagreement 18 about what occurred. Okay. That's all right now. 19 (Jurors deliberating.) 20 (In the presence of the defendant.) THE DEFENDANT: (Defendant raising 21 his hand.) 2.2 THE COURT: Mr. Greenwood, wait just 23 The jury has a verdict. You can stay in 24 a moment. the courtroom if you do not say anything. But if 25

```
you're going to say something, I need to know now,
1
      because then you cannot stay in the courtroom.
2
                      THE DEFENDANT: I ain't going to say
3
      nothing to nobody. I just want to talk to you.
4
                      THE COURT: Well, I don't want
5
       anything said to the jury. Do you understand that?
 6
                      THE DEFENDANT: I ain't going to say
 7
       nothing to them.
 8
 9
                      THE COURT: Okay. Then -- and I
10
       don't want any outbursts from anyone else in the
11
       courtroom.
                      (In the presence of the jury.)
12
                      THE COURT: I understand that you've
13
       reached a verdict and you want the Court to read
14
       the verdict?
15
16
                      THE FOREPERSON: Yes, ma'am.
                    THE COURT: Who has --
17
                      THE BAILIFF: (Hands it over.)
18
                      THE COURT: It is the verdict of the
19
       jury, we, the jury, find the defendant guilty of
20
       robbery in the first degree as charged in the
21
       indictment.
22
23
            Do you want the jury poled?
24
                      MR. HARTLEY: Yes, Judge.
                      THE COURT: I'm going to ask each of
25
```

```
you this same question, and I'll start with you.
1
2
       Is this your verdict?
                      THE JUROR: Yes, ma'am.
3
                      THE JUROR:
                                  Yes.
                      THE JUROR:
                                  Yes, ma'am.
 5
                      THE JUROR: Yes.
 6
 7
                      THE JUROR:
                                  Yes.
 8
                      THE JUROR: Yes.
                      THE JUROR:
                                  Yes.
 9
10
                      THE JUROR:
                                  Yes.
11
                      THE JUROR:
                                  Yes.
12
                      THE JUROR:
                                  Yes.
13
                      THE JUROR:
                                  Yes.
14
                      THE JUROR:
                                  Yes.
                      THE COURT: And let the Record
15
       reflect that all the jurors indicated -- said it
16
       was their verdict. And, in accordance with the
17
       verdict, the Court will adjudicate the defendant
18
19
       guilty as charged.
20
            I want to tell you how much we appreciate your
21
       serving. I know it's been a long two days. And
       I'm hoping that you won't have to come back, but
22
       you still need to call code-a-phone tonight, but I
23
       think we might can work it out where you don't have
24
25
       to be back. We appreciate you serving. And,
```

although I told you earlier I'd explain some 1 delays, I really don't think you care about knowing 2 about them now. They're just, unfortunately, some 3 delays that could not be avoided. And we 4 appreciate your patience and --5 Do you want to take them out the back? 6 THE BAILIFF: Yes, ma'am. 7 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Does this mean 8 we don't have to come back this afternoon? 9 THE COURT: No. You do not --10 you're excused the rest of the day. You've done 11 your civic duty, and you might have for the whole 12 13 week. In fact, call Bob and see if they can be 14 excused. I don't know where we are with jury 15 trials. 16 Because, if you are, it's small compensation, 17 but you can go down and get your juror fees. 18 I do want to say one thing for your 19 information that, although Mr. Greenwood wasn't in 20 here during the Court's closing, arrangements were 21 made so that he could hear everything that was 22 23 going on. MS. STRICKLAND: Right now, they 24 need to call code-a-phone tonight.

25

```
THE COURT: Call code-a-phone.
 1
 2
                      MS. STRICKLAND: Maybe you'll get
 3
       lucky.
                      THE COURT: Okay. And -- they can
 5
       go out the front now, I think.
                     THE BAILIFF: You want them to go
 6
 7
       out the front?
 8
                      THE COURT: Yeah, I think it's okay.
           Everyone needs to stay in the courtroom until
       the jurors leave.
10
11
                      (Out of the presence of the jury.)
12
                      THE COURT: We'll just set
       sentencing for the 30th -- I don't see that on this
13
14
      calendar, but it's a court date, isn't it?
15
                     MS. STRICKLAND: Yes, ma'am.
16
                     THE COURT: And if you'll --
17
                     MS. PERKINS: Is that -- that's
      December 30th of this --
18
19
                      THE COURT: Is somebody asking a
20
      question?
21
                      MS. PERKINS: Me.
22
                      THE COURT: Okay. I'm setting
23
       sentence for December 30th at 8:30.
24
                      MS. PERKINS: 8:30, Judge?
                      THE COURT: Yes.
25
```

1	REPORTER'S CERTIFICATE
2	·
3	STATE OF ALABAMA
4	TALLAPOOSA COUNTY
5	
6	I, Meridith Newman, Court Reporter and
7	Commissioner for the State of Alabama at Large,
8	hereby certify that on Tuesday, December 10, 2002,
9	I reported the TESTIMONY AND PROCEEDINGS in the
10	matter of the foregoing cause, and that the
11	foregoing pages contain a true and accurate
12	transcription of said proceedings.
13	I further certify that I am neither of kin nor
14	of counsel to any of the parties to said cause, nor
15	in any manner interested in the results thereof.
16	This 6th day of February, 2000.
17	
18	
19	Maridathauman
20	Meridith Newman, Court Reporter Commissioner for the State of
21	Alabama at Large
22	MY COMMISSION EXPIRES: 12/30/2005
23	
24	
2.5	